

PART 5

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

WASHINGTON STATE FERRIES
M.V. ELWHA
PROPULSION CONTROL SYSTEM REPLACEMENT
CONTRACT NO. 00-7171

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

1 The following is a general description of the proposal evaluation process for Washington
2 State Ferries' (hereinafter called "WSF") proposed M.V. Elwha Propulsion Control System
3 Replacement Contract (hereinafter called the "Contract"). For specific details, all proposers
4 should refer to the Contract Provisions and Specifications sections of the Request for
5 Proposals ("RFP").

6
7
8 **A. GENERAL**

9
10 WSF is utilizing a Request For Proposals (RFP) solicitation process for this project,
11 as authorized by RCW 47.56.03. Under such a process, the selection of the most
12 advantageous proposal will be based upon price and other evaluation factors specified
13 in the RFP.

14
15 WSF shall evaluate each proposal for: (i) compliance with the Minimum
16 Requirements specified in the RFP Technical Requirements; and (ii) presentation of
17 the most advantageous Proposal (See "Evaluation Factors" below).

18
19
20 **B. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

21
22 WSF will evaluate each proposal for compliance with the Minimum Requirements,
23 specified in the RFP Proposal Requirements document, using a pass/fail analysis.
24 Any proposal that does not meet these Minimum Requirements shall be disqualified
25 from further consideration under this RFP.

26
27
28 **C. EVALUATION FACTORS**

29
30 Proposal evaluation factors to determine the most advantageous Proposal shall be
31 divided into the following six (6) categories: Price; Operational Cost;
32 Maintainability; Reliability; Performance Levels; and Management, Organization and
33 Facilities. A Summary of Evaluation Factors is attached hereto and incorporated
34 herein as Exhibit A.

1 **D. EVALUATION PROCESS**

2
3 Proposal evaluation shall be divided into: (i) a pass/fail evaluation of the Minimum
4 Requirement specified in Section B herein; (ii) an evaluation to identify those
5 proposals within the competitive range; and (iii) a final evaluation to identify the
6 most advantageous Proposal.
7

8 A Summary of Evaluation Process is attached hereto and incorporated herein as
9 Exhibit B. WSF will evaluate the proposals in accordance with the Evaluation
10 Factors, Scoring Methodology and Evaluation Process specified herein.
11

12
13 **E. SCORING METHODOLOGY**

14
15 There are maximum points established for each evaluation category and sub-
16 components thereof. The value of each primary category is specified in Exhibit A.
17 However, to ensure the highest quality proposals, the detailed point schedule is
18 confidential until after selection of the apparent successful proposer.
19

20 For each evaluation category, the evaluators assign points, and the point assignments
21 of all such evaluators are averaged to obtain the final score. The details of the
22 evaluation scoring process will be provided to interested parties, upon request, after
23 selection of the apparent successful proposer.
24

25
26 **F. BASIS FOR AWARD**

27
28 WSF intends to award the Contract to the responsive and responsible proposer who
29 offers WSF the most advantageous proposal. WSF shall identify the apparent
30 successful proposer based upon which proposal meets the Minimum Requirements
31 and receives the highest score in the evaluation process.
32

33 The Contract award shall be for one (1) PCS, inclusive.
34

35
36 **G. RFP PROCESS EXTENSION**

37
38 WSF reserves the right, upon prior notice to all proposers, to request submittal of
39 second (i.e., revised) proposals in order to obtain competitive proposals that comply
40 with the RFP requirements and are within WSF's project budget.

(END)

EXHIBIT A

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FACTORS

Exhibit A

WASHINGTON STATE FERRIES

**M.V. ELWHA
PROPULSION CONTROL SYSTEM
CONTRACT NO. 00-7171**

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FACTORS

<u>FACTORS</u>	<u>VALUE</u>
<u>Price</u>	35 %
1. Total Proposal Price for Evaluation. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- One (1) Propulsion Control System (PCS), plus optional modification and/or refurbishment of equipment.	
<u>Reliability and Maintainability</u>	50 %
1. Quality and completeness of technical information.	
2. Reliability history in similar applications.	
3. Labor and parts cost of maintenance service actions and time between actions.	
4. Compatibility with existing WSF PCS systems.	
5. Machinery arrangement to support maintenance and ease of required maintenance.	
6. Quality and completeness of the training material.	
7. Quality and completeness of the system testing plan.	
<u>Management, Organization and Facilities</u>	15 %
1. Project and Design Organizations	
2. Facilities	
3. Personnel	
TOTAL:	100 %

EXHIBIT B

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION PROCESS

Exhibit B

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION PROCESS

1 The following is a Summary of the proposal evaluation process that Washington State Ferries
2 (hereinafter called "WSF") will utilize for the project Request For Proposals (RFP).
3
4

1. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

5
6
7 A Proposal Evaluation Panel and a Source Selection Official have been established
8 for this RFP. The Evaluation Panel will evaluate the proposals and the Source
9 Selection Official will provide an independent review of the Panel's recommendation
10 (see Section 5 below).
11

12 The Proposal Evaluation Panel reviews and prepares the RFP package in coordination
13 with the Legal Services and Contracts Dept. The Panel members are instructed that,
14 until Contract award, information concerning the proposals must not be disclosed to
15 any person not directly involved in the evaluation process. The proposal evaluations
16 are held in strict confidence to protect the competitive nature of the RFP.
17
18

2. INITIAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION

19
20
21 After the Proposal Due Date, the Proposal Evaluation Panel will evaluate the
22 proposals in accordance with the Proposal Evaluation Procedure in order to: (i)
23 determine proposal compliance with the RFP Minimum Requirements; and (ii) to
24 score each proposal pursuant to the specified evaluation factors.
25

26 In the event that WSF determines that information or documentation required under
27 this RFP has not been included in a proposal, WSF will request that the proposer
28 provide such information within a specified time frame. **A PROPOSER'S
29 FAILURE TO RESPOND ADEQUATELY TO WSF'S REQUEST MAY
30 RESULT IN AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATION OF THAT FIRM'S
31 PROPOSAL FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION.**
32

1
2 **3. COMPETITIVE RANGE**
3

4 Following the initial proposal evaluations, the Evaluation Panel will provide the
5 Source Selection Official with a detailed report recommending a competitive range of
6 proposals for further consideration. The report will identify each proposal as
7 acceptable or unacceptable. The report will include: (i) a copy of the completed
8 initial proposal evaluations; (ii) a narrative evaluation specifying the strengths and
9 weaknesses of each proposal; and (iii) any reservations, qualifications or areas to be
10 addressed that might affect inclusion in the competitive range. The report also
11 includes specific points and questions that are to be raised during discussions with the
12 proposers. A determination of technical acceptability is supported with concrete
13 technical data. The use of phrases such as “it could not be determined” and “sketchy
14 presentation” is not adequate support for unacceptable ratings.
15

16 The competitive range determination will identify: (i) those proposals that currently
17 meet the RFP Minimum Requirements and proposals that will likely meet the RFP
18 Minimum Requirements after discussions with the proposers, if deemed appropriate;
19 and (ii) those proposals which clearly cannot meet the RFP Minimum Requirements.
20 The proposals in compliance will form the recommended competitive range. The
21 competitive range is established either by accepting the recommendation of the
22 Proposal Evaluation Panel or increasing/decreasing the membership after review by
23 the Source Selection Official. Broad case-by-case discretion is exercised as to the
24 extent and membership of the competitive range. The range may consist of any
25 number of proposers, perhaps only one in appropriate cases. Typically, a moderate or
26 larger number of members is preferred in order to maximize project competition.
27

28 WSF will formally notify all proposers whether they are within the competitive range.
29 Only those proposals within the competitive range will be allowed to proceed in the
30 RFP process.
31

32
33 **4. PROPOSAL DISCUSSIONS**
34

35 After initial proposal evaluations, WSF will determine whether it needs to conduct
36 oral and/or written discussions with each proposer in the competitive range. In such
37 event, proposers will have an opportunity to support, clarify, correct, improve or
38 revise their proposals, all by a common cut-off date. WSF anticipates sending each
39 proposer, in advance, a list of items for discussion. Reference to the content of other
40 proposals will be avoided during such discussions.
41

42 Additionally, during the proposal discussions, proposers may suggest alternatives to
43 sections of the RFP Specifications. Proposed alternatives should focus on
44 improvements to performance and reliability as well as potential cost reductions.
45

WSF comments, requests and recommendations regarding a specific proposal will be kept confidential during this proposal discussion process. Modification of RFP content or other common information that is necessary or appropriate for all proposers will be issued by RFP Addenda.

5. FINAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION

WSF will conduct final proposal evaluation upon: (i) completion of the initial proposal evaluations, if no proposal discussions are deemed necessary; or (ii) after proposal discussions with proposers in the competitive range, and receipt of any requested supplemental information. The Evaluation Panel will evaluate and score the proposals in accordance with the Proposal Evaluation Procedure. After establishing an evaluation score for each proposal, the Evaluation Panel will produce a final proposal evaluation report recommending either: (i) selection of the proposal which is most advantageous to WSF, considering price and other evaluation factors set forth in the RFP; or (ii) rejection of all proposals.

Additionally, in accordance with the RFP Proposal Evaluation document, the Panel reserves the right to recommend submittal of second (i.e., revised) final proposals in order to obtain competitive proposals that comply with the RFP requirements and are within WSF's project budget.

6. SELECTION

After reviewing the final proposal evaluation report, the Source Selection Official may: (i) endorse the Panel's recommendation for selection or rejection, as provided above; (ii) endorse the Panel's (optional) recommendation for submittal of revised proposals; or (iii) request further review of the Panel's recommendation.

WSF will select the apparent successful proposal based upon the evaluation scores. WSF may conduct a final discussion with such proposer to "perfect" the proposal; Provided, such process shall be considered "fine tuning", not substantive revision.

(END)